

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,134	03/11/2004	Gregory H. Altman	032794-054911-CIP	6963
50828 75	590 08/28/2006		EXAMINER	
DAVID S. RESNICK			NAFF, DAVID M	
100 SUMMER STREET NIXON PEABODY LLP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02110-2131			1651	
			DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/800,134	ALTMAN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David M. Naff	1651	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tivil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed  the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 M	arch 2004.		
	action is non-final.	·	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pr	osecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) <u>1-49</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.		
, <u> </u>			
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		_	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• ,		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	)-(d) or (f).	
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		ion No	
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the prior			
application from the International Bureau	•		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ed.	
222 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2			
AMaah			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Praftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)	

7.

Application/Control Number: 10/800,134 Page 2

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

25

## Election/Restrictions

Claims in the application are 1-49.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-31, drawn to a fabric comprising a yarn comprising one or more sericin-extracted fibroin fibers, and which may contain seeded cells, classified in class 424, subclass 93.7.
  - II. Claims 32-49, drawn to a method of forming a fabric, which may contain a drug, classified in class 424, subclass 484.

The inventions are independent or distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the fabric of invention I can be prepared by a method different than required by invention II. For example, the fabric of invention I can be produced by a method where sericin is extracted from fibers before yarn is produced rather than after yarn is produced as required by the method of invention II. Additionally, the fabric of invention I is required to be biodegradable, and the yarn of the fabric can comprise one fibroin fiber, whereas in the method of invention II the fabric does not have

Application/Control Number: 10/800,134

Art Unit: 1651

10

20

to be biodegradable and more than one fiber is required to produce the yarn.

Page 3

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Examining inventions I and II together will be a serious burden due to each invention requiring a different search and different considerations in applying prior art.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or

15 without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be

made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically

point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election

shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission

Application/Control Number: 10/800,134 Page 4

Art Unit: 1651

20

25

30

35

may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Application/Control Number: 10/800,134 Page 5

Art Unit: 1651

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M. Naff whose telephone number is 571-272-0920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David M. Naff Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651

5

10

15